



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

at the expense of foundation work. One reason why classical instruction has been so fertile is that the content has been thoroughly studied for generations and information about it is easily accessible. Furthermore, this material, selected after years of experience, is really the best. My boys are particularly rich in human nature and they find the spot of least resistance as surely as a hydraulic press. If they know that the work in hand is not to be definitely examined for College entrance they cannot be made to do it as carefully as good training requires. Every good thing has the vices of its virtues and mere interesting reading, when pursued to a large extent, produces superficiality, too much of the 'good enough to pass' spirit. Many pupils can succeed in Latin, to their life-long profit, who do not like to believe so for they know it means hard work. The Rev. Endicott Peabody of Groton said at a meeting of the Harvard Teachers Association in March, 1908,

There is just as much chance of a boy's being born again intellectually as there is of his being born again spiritually and the parent ought ever to be on the lookout for a new intellectual birth. It is an awful mistake to be satisfied with the boy's just getting through.

With the multifarious demands of modern life established as fixtures and a general lessening of the habit of self-denying labor (on the part of everybody except teachers), with increased demands from scientific subjects, with the concreteness of Mathematics and History as competing subjects, the languages are hard put to it to secure as much study as they require for their best results. Interesting material is a help; but in spite of live stuff and a live teacher there is bound to be here, as in other branches, a certain percentage of deaths from what a medical report might call 'congenital debility'—a lack of the fundamental qualities that make success everywhere. Is it not true that of everything, teachers included, there is about $\frac{1}{3}$ good, $\frac{1}{3}$ bad, $\frac{1}{3}$ good or bad according to circumstances? Experience shows that the teacher may make the work interesting to nearly everyone and yet may not make his pupils do the hard work necessary to master a difficult language. Of course all the pupils are willing to be entertained. Here we are bound to acknowledge one limit to the feasibility of enlivening the Latin class-room. We can only emulate a certain member of the National Industrial Commission of whom it has been said that he can 'put teeth into a cotton flannel dog'.

You have noticed that this paper makes no attempt at philosophical treatment. There are many such articles accessible. Nor does it even suggest that the same methods would apply in detail to anyone else. The illustrations taken from daily class-room experience during the preparation of the paper are merely suggestive.

In brief, then, the teacher of Latin should not become desiccated. He should be alive, growing, and ambitious, be ready with up-to-date illustrative material; connect his subject with modern speech and thought and life; use as fully as seems wise the boundless field of allusions. If you ask how we can find time for this along with the relentless drill, I can only say, 'Peas in a barrel of apples'.

A modicum of nonsense now and then, some of it Latin nonsense, is not amiss, in spite of that omnipresent youth who will always add on his own nonsense after you have, yourself, gone quite far enough. If someone cannot solve the word *ēst*, or *mālum*, or *meātus*, we may write on the board that sentence which seems to say sacrilegiously, 'My mother is a bad sow', but which proves, upon closer acquaintance, to mean, 'Run, ma, the pig's eating the apples', *Mea mater est mala sus*; or the familiar *Equus in stabulo, sed non est*, or, for a cognate accusative, *pugno pugnas pugnāt*, ('he fights battles with the first').

THE HAVERFORD SCHOOL.

F. A. DAKIN.

REVIEWS

Historische Lautlehre des Lateinischen. Von Max Niedermann. Zweite Auflage. Heidelberg: Winter (1911). Pp. XVII + 124. 2 Marks.

Historische Formenlehre des Lateinischen. Von Alfred Ernout. Deutsche Uebersetzung von Hans Meltzer. Heidelberg: Winter (1913). Pp. XII + 204. 2.80 Marks.

An 'interest device' that is intended for the upper classes in the Gymnasium—i.e. for college freshmen and sophomores—and is based on scientific grammar! That is a description that will perhaps not carry conviction to all. And yet if the thing can be done it has certain obvious advantages over our somewhat disingenuous attempts to convince our students that Latin is still a fit medium for conversation.

Niedermann's *Précis de Phonétique Historique du Latin* appeared in 1906, and a German translation was published in the following year. The first edition of the latter was soon exhausted, and the author took advantage of the opportunity to make a thorough revision, which was published, as noted above, in 1911. The book is not to be put into the hands of students; it is intended as a manual for the teacher who wants to put life into his grammatical instruction by tracing the development of early Latin into classical and late Latin or pointing out the relation of Latin forms to one another. Still the treatment is so interesting, so clear, and so concise that most of it might well be passed on to the class just as it stands. There is no comparative grammar in the book; even Greek is rigidly excluded, since so many students of Latin know no Greek. But grammarians have been astonished at

the clearness and the relative completeness of the account of Latin phonological development which Niedermann has been able to build up on the basis of the Latin evidence alone.

Among the additions made in the second edition may be mentioned introductory paragraphs on the position of Latin among the related languages, a discussion of haplogy (page 103), many remarks on parallels and contrasts between Latin and German, translations of the numerous passages cited from the Roman grammarians, and indexes of Roman authors and of Latin words. Of course so active a scholar as Niedermann has changed his mind about more than one detail in the lapse of five years. Cases in point are the treatment of the republican spelling *uo* for imperial *uu* (pp. 22, 27, 38 f.), and of *oe* instead of *u* from prehistoric *oi* (31). The improvements are so numerous and important that this second German edition will prove more serviceable to American teachers than the English translation of the first (French) edition which appeared under the title *Outlines of Latin Phonetics* edited by H. A. Strong and H. Stewart (George Routledge and Sons, London, 1910; E. P. Dutton and Co., New York, 1910. 80 cents).

Ernout, a much less experienced scholar than Niedermann, undertakes to apply the same method to the more difficult subject of Latin forms. Small wonder that his success is less brilliant! He has repeated the material given by the school grammars, with somewhat more attention to early and late Latin than they have room for, and has appended such explanatory remarks as he could without citing the related forms in other languages. Sometimes for a page or two together he is clear and interesting; but more often the treatment is composed in about equal proportions of a recital of grammatical facts familiar to all teachers and explanations that can scarcely be understood without some knowledge of comparative grammar.

Perhaps nobody could write a really satisfactory treatment of Latin forms on just this plan, but some improvement would be easily possible. For example, if the pronominal genitives *eius*, *cuius*, *illius*, etc., had all been discussed together, the peculiarities of the formation might have been brought into sharp relief. As it is, one learns that *istius* has a variant *isti*, and, two pages later, that *huius* is often monosyllabic in the early dramatists; later come similar statements about *ipsius*, *eius*, and *cuius*. There is no hint that the several short forms have any connection with one another.

In general, Ernout is familiar with his subject. Occasionally he adds something to our knowledge, even though the plan of the book compels him to avoid controversial matters. I have noticed a few blunders. On page 18 it is stated that in republican poetry final *s* is often elided before a vowel. On page 25 such forms as *municipis* = *municipiis* are

ascribed to Plautus's cantica. Dissyllabic *dii*, *diis*, *ii*, and *iis* are cited on pages 21 and 65. On page 122 it is stated that the third person plural future (originally subjunctive) of *lego* once had the form **legōnt*.

Any teacher of Latin, whether in High School or College, would find it worth his while to read Niedermann's *Lautlehre*. If some lack time or inclination to attack the German edition, the English translation mentioned above will serve them very well. Ernout's *Formenlehre* is much less important.
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. E. H. STURTEVANT.

A sweeping condemnation of the Classics appears in *The Outlook* for Saturday, April 18. The article is vulnerable enough, but of just the sort to carry conviction to the uninitiate. The editors of *The Outlook* invite discussion of this article; they promise that, if there is real discussion of the subject, they will make clear their own position. We cannot afford to let the matter go by default. Read the article, write yourself to *The Outlook*, and, above all, get others to write, especially those who are not primarily classicists. Particularly valuable in this connection will be such testimony as Professor West of Princeton gave in an article in *The Educational Review* for March last, and, in briefer form, in a letter in *The New York Times* of April 25. I quote from the letter the statements about the relative proficiency at Princeton of students who have had Greek and those who have not had Greek.

The Bachelors of Arts <who alone have had Greek> have maintained a clear lead over the others in all the humanistic studies, such as philosophy, history, politics, economics, archaeology, Latin, English, and modern languages. They have at least fairly tied and sometimes have led the others in mathematics, physics, and geology, and have not done as well in chemistry and biology, though in the advanced courses in chemistry they take the lead at the end. The Bachelors of Science come second, and in a few instances surpass the Bachelors of Arts. The Bachelors of Letters, as a rule come third. Moreover, the Bachelors of Arts lead the others every year in the small percentage of "dropped" students.
C. K.

There is, fortunately, room in this issue for the following extract from *The Nation*:

Imagination in College
... On the Atlantic seaboard the humanistic ideal still survives to some extent. Probably the State universities more nearly fulfil their purpose, although the older institutions are by no means such abject failures as some people would have us believe. However, the latter do seem to lose their inspiration in proportion as they subordinate the classics, and some of us who owe allegiance to more "up-to-date" branches of learning would like to see the old supremacy reestablished. To us Plato and Aristotle seem to give a finer stimulus than stock-raising and the theory of the gas engine, and Sophocles to yield a deeper insight than Sudermann or stereotomy.
PRINCETON, N. J., March 21, 1914. T. K. WHIPPLE.